

Translation

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Rec'd PCT/PTO 03 MAY 2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference 46421 WO/NZ	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Form PCT/IPEA/416	
International application No. PCT/DE2003/003667	International filing date (day/month/year) 05 November 2003 (05.11.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 05 November 2002 (05.11.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC H01L 51/20, H01L 51/00		
Applicant SIEMENS AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT		

1. This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.
3. This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, comprising:
 - a. ☒ (sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau) a total of 2 sheets, as follows:
 - ☐ sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).
 - ☐ sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.
 - b. ☐ (sent to the International Bureau only) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)) _____, containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in computer readable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).

4. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the report
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 14 May 2004 (14.05.2004)	Date of completion of this report 07 March 2005 (07.03.2005)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/DE2003/003667

Box No. I Basis of the report

1. With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

- ☐ This report is based on translations from the original language into the following language _____, which is language of a translation furnished for the purpose of:
- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
- ☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
- ☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this report is based on *(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report)*:

- ☐ The international application as originally filed/furnished
- ☒ the description:
- pages _____ 1-5 _____, as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☒ the claims:
- pages _____ 8 _____, as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
- pages* 1-7 received by this Authority on 17 January 2005 (17.01.2005)
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☒ the drawings:
- pages _____ 1/1 _____, as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to sequence listing (*specify*): _____

* If item 4 applies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/DE 03/03667

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	3, 4, 6, 7	YES
	Claims	1, 2, 5	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	3, 4, 6, 7	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-7	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

1 This report makes reference to the following documents:

- D1: ROGERS J A ET AL: 'PRINTING PROCESS SUITABLE FOR REEL-TO-REEL PRODUCTION OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE ORGANIC TRANSISTORS AND CIRCUITS' ADVANCED MATERIALS, VCH VERLAGSGESELLSCHAFT, WEINHEIM, DE, Vol. 11, No. 9, 5 July 1999 (1999-07-05), pages 741-745, XP000851834 ISSN: 0935-9648
- D2: US-B1-6 429 450 (DE LEEUW DAGOBERT M ET AL) 6 August 2002 (2002-08-06)
- D3: WO 02/05361 A (3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES CO) 17 January 2002 (2002-01-17)
- D4: EP-A-0 966 182 (LG ELECTRONICS INC) 22 December 1999 (1999-12-22)
- D5: EP-A-1 237 207 (FUJI FOTO FILM CO LTD) 4 September 2002 (2002-09-04)
- D6: DE 100 61 297 A (SIEMENS AG) 27 June 2002 (2002-06-27)
- D7: DE 102 19 905 A (OSRAM OPTO SEMICONDUCTORS GMBH) 4 December 2003 (2003-12-04)
- D8: US-B1-6 403 396 (GUDESEN HANS GUDE ET AL) 11 June 2002 (2002-06-11).

- 2 The application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6, because claims 1 and 2 lack clarity.
- 2.1 The wording in the device claim 1 "... was produced by means of a laser..." refers to a method for producing the device rather than to the definition of the device in terms of its technical features. Therefore, contrary to PCT Article 6, the intended restrictions are not clear from the claim.
- 2.2 The wording "sharp edges and a rough surface..." used in claims 1 and 2 is vague and unclear and leaves the reader uncertain as to the meaning of the technical feature in question. As a result, the subject matter of said claim is not clearly defined (PCT Article 6).
- 3 The present application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(2), because the subject matter of claims 1, 2, and 5 lacks novelty, insofar as the claims can be understood in light of the lack of clarity mentioned above.
- 3.1 The subject matter of claim 1 lacks novelty in view of the disclosure of D1 (see figure 2 and the corresponding text passage) and that of D2 (see figure 2 and the corresponding text passage).
- 3.2 The subject matter of claims 2 and 5 lacks novelty in view of the disclosure in D4 (see figure 7 and the corresponding text passage).
- 4 Dependent claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 contain no additional features that, in combination with the features of

any claim to which they refer, could lead to subject matter involving an inventive step (PCT Article 33(3)), since they are merely standard technical measures (see, for example, D3, figure 4 and the corresponding text passage; D6, figures 1-2 and the corresponding text passage).

- 5 The following has been noted in the interest of completeness.
- 5.1 Independent claim 2 has not been drafted in the two-part form defined by PCT Rule 6.3(b). However, in the present case the two-part form would appear to be appropriate. Accordingly, the features known in combination from the prior art should have been placed in the preamble (PCT Rule 6.3(b)(i)) and the remaining features specified in the characterising part (PCT Rule 6.3(b)(ii)).
- 5.2 Contrary to the requirements of PCT Rule 5.1(a)(ii), the description neither cites documents D1-D6 nor indicates the prior art disclosed therein.